

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

8 CORTRAYER ZONE, )  
9 Plaintiff, )  
10 v. ) 2:14-cv-1343-LDG-CWH  
11 SHERIFF GILLESPIE et al., ) **ORDER**  
12 Defendants. )  
13 \_\_\_\_\_ )

14 This action is a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a  
15 county prisoner. On November 21, 2014, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to  
16 update the Court with his current address within thirty days from the date of entry of this order.  
17 (ECF No. 3 at 6). The thirty-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an updated  
18 address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

19 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of  
20 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.  
21 *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court  
22 may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure  
23 to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52,  
24 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963  
25 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring  
26 amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal  
27 for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of  
28 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for

1 failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)  
 2 (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

3 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a  
 4 court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1)  
 5 the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its  
 6 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of  
 7 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. *Thompson*, 782 F.2d  
 8 at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-  
 9 61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

10 In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
 11 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh  
 12 in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
 13 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in  
 14 filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542  
 15 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy favoring disposition of cases  
 16 on their merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein.  
 17 Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in  
 18 dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives" requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262;  
 19 *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring  
 20 Plaintiff to file his current address within thirty days expressly stated: "**IT IS FURTHER**  
 21 **ORDERED** that if Plaintiff does not update the Court with his current address within thirty (30)  
 22 days from the date of entry of this order, the Court will dismiss this action **with** prejudice."  
 23 (ECF No. 3 at 7). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would result from his  
 24 noncompliance with the Court's order to file his current address within thirty days.

25 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed with prejudice based on Plaintiff's  
 26 failure to file his current address in compliance with this Court's November 21, 2014, order.

27 ///

28 ///

1 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.  
2  
3 DATED: This 23 day of December, 2014.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE